UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

District of New Mexico

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

V.

Judgment in a Criminal Case

(For **Revocation** of Probation or Supervised Release)

Saulo Torres-Facundo

Case No

Case Number: 2:07CR01227-001JB USM Number: 24258-051

Defense Attorney: Greg Garvey, Appointed

THE DEFEND	ANT:		
_	quilt to violations of condition(s) MC of the term in violation of condition(s) after denial of guilt.	of supervision.	
The defendant i	is adjudicated guilty of these violations:		
Violation Number	Nature of Violation	Violation Ended	
1	MC-The defendant committed another federal,	state, or local crime 12/10/2009	
Γhe defendant i Act of 1984.	s sentenced as provided in pages 1 through 2 of th	is judgment. The sentence is imposed pursuant to the Sentencing Reform	
☐ The defend	dant has not violated condition(s) and is discharg	ged as to such violation(s).	
		United States attorney for this district within 30 days of any change of osts, and special assessments imposed by this judgment are fully paid.	
		June 16, 2010	
Defendant's Soc. Sec. No.		Date of Imposition of Judgment	
07/10/1981		/s/ James O. Browning	
Defendant's Date of Birth		Signature of Judge	
Buena Vista		Honorable James O. Browning United States District Judge	
Michoacan MX Defendant's Residence Address		Name and Title of Judge	
Defendant 5 Ac	sidence radioss	Traine and True of Juage	
,		July 9, 2010	
Defendant's Mailing Address		Date Signed	
Dona Ana			
County of Resi	dence		

AO 245D (Rev. 12/03) Judgment in a Criminal Case for Revocations

Sheet 2 Imprisonment Judgment Page 2 of 2

Defendant: Saulo Torres-Facundo Case Number: 2:07CR01227-001JB

IMPRISONMENT

The defendant is committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a total term of 8 months.

One month of said term shall run consecutively, and 7 months of said term shall run concurrently, to the sentence imposed in 10CR00047-00PRM.

Although advisory, the Court has considered the Guidelines and, in arriving at its sentence, has taken account of the Guidelines with other sentencing goals. Specifically, the Court has considered the Guidelines` sentencing range established for the applicable category of offense committed by the applicable category of Defendant. The Court believes that the Guidlines` punishment is appropriate for this sort of offense. Therefore, the sentence in this judgment is consistent with a guideline sentence. The Court has considered the kind of sentence and range established by the Guidelines. The Court believes that a sentence of 8 months reflects the seriousness of the offense, promotes respect for the law, provides just punishment, affords adequate deterrence, protects the public and effectively provides the Defendant with needed education or vocational training and medical care, and otherwise fully reflects each of the factors embodied in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a). The Court also believes the sentence is reasonable. The Court believes the sentence is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes set forth in the Sentencing Reform Act.

	The court makes these recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons:	
	The defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States Mars The defendant must surrender to the United States Marshal for this of at on as notified by the United States Marshal. The defendant must surrender for service of sentence at the institution before 2 p.m. on as notified by the United States Marshal as notified by the Probation or Pretrial Service Office.	listrict:
	RETURN	
I hav	eve executed this judgment by:	
Defe	Tendant delivered on at at	to with a Certified copy of this judgment.
	UNITE	D STATES MARSHAL

Case 2:07-cr-01227-JB Document 42 Filed 07/09/10 Page 3 of 3

Deputy United States Marshal